UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/718,868	11/20/2000	Jeffrey G. Ort	112076-138352	2260

25943 7590 07/05/2007

SCHWABE, WILLIAMSON & WYATT, P.C.
PACWEST CENTER, SUITE 1900
1211 SW FIFTH AVENUE
PORTLAND, OR 97204

EXAMINER	
WANG, JIN CHENG	
ART UNIT	**PAPER NUMBER**
2628	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
07/05/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Commissioner for Patents
United States Patent and Trademark Office
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

BEFORE THE BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS AND INTERFERENCES

Application Number: 09/718,868
Filing Date: November 20, 2000
Appellant(s): ORT ET AL.

Robert C. Peck
For Appellant

EXAMINER'S ANSWER

This is in response to the appeal brief filed February 16, 2007 appealing from the Office action mailed 5/3/2004.

(1) Real Party in Interest

A statement identifying by name the real party in interest is contained in the brief.

(2) Related Appeals and Interferences

The examiner is not aware of any related appeals, interferences, or judicial proceedings which will directly affect or be directly affected by or have a bearing on the Board's decision in the pending appeal.

(3) Status of Claims

The statement of the status of claims contained in the brief is incorrect. A correct statement of the status of the claims is as follows:

Claims 11 and 32 have been amended subsequent to the final rejection.

Claims 10 and 31 have been canceled.

(4) Status of Amendments After Final

The appellant's statement of the status of amendments after final rejection contained in the brief is correct.

(5) Summary of Claimed Subject Matter

The summary of claimed subject matter contained in the brief is correct.

(6) Grounds of Rejection to be Reviewed on Appeal

The appellant's statement of the grounds of rejection to be reviewed on appeal is substantially correct. The changes are as follows: claims 11 and 32 are now in the form of independent claims as amended on this appeal after Final Rejection. The claims 10 and 31 have been canceled on this appeal.

(7) Claims Appendix

The copy of the appealed claims contained in the Appendix to the brief is correct.

(8) Evidence Relied Upon

5,638,501	Gough	06-1997
6,002,397	Jaaskelainen	12-1999

(9) Grounds of Rejection

The following ground(s) of rejection are applicable to the appealed claims:

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –
>
> (e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

2. Claims 1-9, 11, 13, 15-16, 18, 22-30, 32, 34, 36-37 and 39 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being fully anticipated by Gough et al. U.S. Patent No. 5,638,501 (hereinafter Gough).

3. Claim 1:

Gough teaches a method comprising:

copying and saving first pixel values corresponding to a first display screen area (e.g., column 6, lines 50-67; column 7, lines 1-67; column 8, lines 1-67; column 9, lines 1-67; column 10, lines 1-22; column 11, lines 10-67; column 12, lines 1-17);

blending the copied first pixel values with second pixel values to generate third pixel values (e.g., column 11, lines 10-67; column 12, lines 1-17; the blending Engine 190 takes the inputs both from the RAM overlay screen buffer 194 and the RAM screen buffer 192 wherein the RAM overlay screen buffer 194 stores the second pixel values and RAM screen buffer 192 stores the copied first pixel values);

replacing the original first pixel values with the third pixel values to effectuate display of a non-blocking always visible display (e.g., column 11, lines 10-67; column 12, lines 1-17; the blended image replaces the original image in the VRAM buffer wherein the VRAM buffer stores the third pixel values);

monitoring for display operations that impact the first display screen area (e.g., column 11, lines 10-67; column 12, lines 1-17);

upon detection of such a display operation, replacing said third pixel values with said first pixel values using said saved first pixel values (e.g., figures 6a-16; column 6, lines 50-67; column 7, lines 1-67; column 8, lines 1-67; column 9, lines 1-67; column 10, lines 1-22; column 11, lines 10-67; column 12, lines 1-17);

upon completion of the detected operation, copying and saving fourth pixel values corresponding to the first display screen area (e.g., figures 6a-16; column 6, lines 50-67; column 7, lines 1-67; column 8, lines 1-67; column 9, lines 1-67; column 10, lines 1-22; column 11, lines 10-67; column 12, lines 1-17);

blending the copied fourth pixel values with said second pixel values to generate fifth pixel values (e.g., figures 6a-16; column 6, lines 50-67; column 7, lines 1-67; column 8, lines 1-67; column 9, lines 1-67; column 10, lines 1-22; column 11, lines 10-67; column 12, lines 1-17);

replacing the original fourth pixel values with the fifth pixel values to sustain the non-blocking always visible characteristic of the non-blocking always visible display (e.g., figures 6a-16; column 6, lines 50-67; column 7, lines 1-67; column 8, lines 1-67; column 9, lines 1-67; column 10, lines 1-22; column 11, lines 10-67; column 12, lines 1-17).

Claim 2:

The claim 2 encompasses the same scope of invention as that of claim 1 except additional claimed limitation of marking a buffer holding said third/fifth pixel values changed and periodically checking to determine if said buffer has been marked changed.

However, Gough further discloses the claimed limitation of marking a buffer holding said third/fifth pixel values changed and periodically checking to determine if said buffer has been marked changed (e.g., column 11, lines 10-67; column 12, lines 1-67).

Claim 3:

The claim 3 encompasses the same scope of invention as that of claim 1 except additional claimed limitation of intercepting invocations of display screen memory operations; and determining if targeted display screen areas of the display screen memory operations being invoked intersect with said first screen display area.

However, Gough further discloses the claimed limitation of intercepting invocations of display screen memory operations; and determining if targeted display screen areas of the display screen memory operations being invoked intersect with said first screen display area (e.g., column 7, lines 1-22; column 11, lines 10-67; column 12, lines 1-17).

Claim 4:

The claim 4 encompasses the same scope of invention as that of claim 1 except additional claimed limitation of intercepting cursor events associated with said first display screen area; and determining whether the cursor events are to be handled by an application program associated with said non-blocking always visible display or an application program associated with an underlying display window.

However, Gough further discloses the claimed limitation of intercepting cursor events associated with said first display screen area; and determining whether the cursor events (e.g., (e.g., screen inputs; the menu bar; icons; column 5, lines 5-15; column 5, lines 48-63) are to be handled by an application program associated with said non-blocking always visible display or an application program associated with an underlying display window (e.g., column 7, lines 1-67; column 8, lines 1-60; column 11, lines 10-67; column 12, lines 1-17).

Claim 5:

The claim 5 encompasses the same scope of invention as that of claim 4 except additional claimed limitation of each of said blending being performed in accordance with a then current blending setting, and determining if the current blending setting is greater than a predetermined threshold, favoring contents of said non-blocking always visible display.

However, Gough further discloses the claimed limitation of each of said blending being performed in accordance with a then current blending setting, and determining if the current blending setting is greater than a predetermined threshold, favoring (e.g., transparent versus translucent; column 6, lines 50-64; favoring the underlying display window in alpha blending with the multiplier alpha less than 0.5 being applied to the underlying display window; column

10, lines 23-41) contents of said non-blocking always visible display (e.g., column 7, lines 1-67; column 8, lines 1-60; column 11, lines 10-67; column 12, lines 1-17).

Claim 6:

The claim 6 encompasses the same scope of invention as that of claim 1 except additional claimed limitation of said non-blocking always visible display being a selected one of an on-line data monitor, a tool bar, a logo/mark, and an animated assistant.

However, Gough further discloses the claimed limitation of said non-blocking always visible display being a selected one of an on-line data monitor, a tool bar, a logo/mark, and an animated assistant (e.g., column 5, lines 5-65; column 5, lines 50-64; column 7, lines 1-67; column 8, lines 1-60; column 11, lines 10-67; column 12, lines 1-17).

4. Claim 7:

Gough teaches a method comprising:

copying and saving first pixel values corresponding to a first display screen area (e.g., column 6, lines 50-67; column 7, lines 1-67; column 8, lines 1-67; column 9, lines 1-67; column 10, lines 1-22; column 11, lines 10-67; column 12, lines 1-17);

blending the copied first pixel values with second pixel values to generate third pixel values (e.g., column 11, lines 10-67; column 12, lines 1-17);

replacing the original first pixel values with the third pixel values to effectuate display of a non-blocking always visible display (e.g., column 11, lines 10-67; column 12, lines 1-17);

intercepting cursor events associated with said first display screen area (e.g., column 11, lines 10-67; column 12, lines 1-17);

determining whether the cursor events (e.g., column 5, lines 5-65; column 5, lines 50-64; column 7, lines 1-67) are to be handled by an application program associated with said non-blocking always visible display or an application program associated with an underlying display window, based at least in part on a current blending bias (e.g., transparent versus translucent; column 6, lines 50-64; favoring the underlying display window in alpha blending with the multiplier alpha less than 0.5 being applied to the underlying display window; column 10, lines 23-41) between said non-blocking always visible display and said underlying display windows (e.g., figures 6a-16; column 6, lines 50-67; column 7, lines 1-67; column 8, lines 1-67; column 9, lines 1-67; column 10, lines 1-22; column 11, lines 10-67; column 12, lines 1-17).

Claims 8-9:

The claim 8(9) encompasses the same scope of invention as that of claim 7 except additional claimed limitation as recited in claim 5(6). The claim is rejected for the same reasons set forth in claim 5(6).

5. Claim 11:

Gough teaches a method comprising:

copying and saving first pixel values corresponding to a first display screen area on which a non-block always visible on-line data monitor is to be rendered (e.g., column 6, lines 50-67; column 7, lines 1-67; column 8, lines 1-67; column 9, lines 1-67; column 10, lines 1-22; column 11, lines 10-67; column 12, lines 1-17);

blending the copied first pixel values with second pixel values corresponding to the non-block always visible on-line data monitor to generate third pixel values (e.g., column 11, lines 10-67; column 12, lines 1-17); and

replacing the original first pixel values with the third pixel values to effectuate display of the on-line data monitor with the non-blocking always visible attribute to provide visual differentiation between said on-line data monitor and underlying display windows associated with locally executed application programs (e.g., figures 5a-12; column 6, lines 50-64; column 11, lines 10-67; column 12, lines 1-17).

Gough further discloses the claimed limitation of monitoring for display operations that impact the first display screen area (e.g., figures 5a-16; column 11, lines 10-67; column 12, lines 1-17);

upon detection of such a display operation, replacing said third pixel values with said first pixel values using said saved first pixel values (e.g., figures 5a-16; column 6, lines 50-67; column 7, lines 1-67; column 8, lines 1-67; column 9, lines 1-67; column 10, lines 1-22; column 11, lines 10-67; column 12, lines 1-17);

upon completion of the detected operation, copying and saving fourth pixel values corresponding to the first display screen area (e.g., figures 5a-16; column 6, lines 50-67; column 7, lines 1-67; column 8, lines 1-67; column 9, lines 1-67; column 10, lines 1-22; column 11, lines 10-67; column 12, lines 1-17);

blending the copied fourth pixel values with said second pixel values to generate fifth pixel values (e.g., figures 5a-16; column 6, lines 50-67; column 7, lines 1-67; column 8, lines 1-67; column 9, lines 1-67; column 10, lines 1-22; column 11, lines 10-67; column 12, lines 1-17);

replacing the original fourth pixel values with the fifth pixel values to sustain the non-blocking always visible characteristic of the non-blocking always visible display (e.g., figures 5a-16; column 6, lines 50-67; column 7, lines 1-67; column 8, lines 1-67; column 9, lines 1-67; column 10, lines 1-22; column 11, lines 10-67; column 12, lines 1-17).

6. Claims 13 and 15:

The claim 13(15) encompasses the same scope of invention as that of claim 1(7 and 9). The claims are subject to same reasons set forth in claims 1(7 and 9).

7. Claims 16 and 18:

The claim 16(18) encompasses the same scope of invention as that of claim 1(7 and 9). The claims are subject to same reasons set forth in claims 1(7 and 9).

8. Claims 22-27:

The claim 22(23-27) encompasses the same scope of invention as that of claims 1(2-6) except the additional claim limitation of an apparatus. However, Gough further discloses the claim limitation of an apparatus (e.g., figure 1; column 4-5).

9. Claims 28-30:

The claim 28(29-30) encompasses the same scope of invention as that of claims 7(8-9) except the additional claim limitation of an apparatus. However, Gough further discloses the claim limitation of an apparatus (e.g., figure 1; column 4-5).

10. Claim 32:

The claim 32 encompasses the same scope of invention as that of claims 11 except the additional claim limitation of an apparatus. However, Gough further discloses the claim limitation of an apparatus (e.g., figure 1; column 4-5).

11. Claims 34 and 36:

The claim 34(36) encompasses the same scope of invention as that of claims 13(15) except the additional claim limitation of an apparatus. However, Gough further discloses the claim limitation of an apparatus (e.g., figure 1; column 4-5).

12. Claims 37 and 39:

The claim 37(39) encompasses the same scope of invention as that of claims 16(18) except the additional claim limitation of an apparatus. However, Gough further discloses the claim limitation of an apparatus (e.g., figure 1; column 4-5).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

13. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

14. Claims 19, 21, 40 and 42 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gough et al. U.S. Patent No. 5,638,501(hereinafter Gough) in view of Jaaskelainen, U.S. Patent No. 6,002,397 (hereinafter Jaaskelainen).

Gough discloses most of the features included in claims 19 and 21, but is silent to some additional features as recited in these Claims. However, these additional features are described in the Jaaskelainen refrence, wherein the methods of: copying and saving first pixel values corresponding to a first display screen area on which a non-blocking always visible animated assistant is to be rendered. The Jaaskelainen reference describes a navigational aid that is presented to a user in a popup window list (Col. 14, Lines 38-41). The automated assistant (automatic help tool) is described in the reference at Col. 14, Lines 41-45 wherein the user can traverse a window in conjunction with blended or non-blended windows/image hierarchy, wherein the user is shown which window the pointer icon (automatic help tool) was currently located. A special window or portion of the window list, as described above, can display the window. If the use of an automated assistant was combined with the same blending method as described in Gough, then an automated assistant could be employed together in an always-visible display screen. Such a combination would have been obvious when automated assistants in a graphical user interface that allows for an always-visible display screen is the objective.

15. Claims 40 and 42:

The claim 40(42) encompasses the same scope of invention as that of claims 19(21) except the additional claim limitation of an apparatus. However, Gough further discloses the claim limitation of an apparatus (e.g., figure 1; column 4-5).

(10) Response to Argument

On Page 21 in the remarks, the Appellant argued with respect to the claim 1 in substance:

(A) "Note that replacing the blended third pixel values with the original pre-blended pixel values is not just another pixel copy operation. The requirement represents a unique and novel 'swap back' approach, where blended pixel values are replaced by the saved pre-blend pixel values."

In response to the arguments in (A), the Appellant argues in essence with respect to claim 1 that Gough et al. does not teach or suggest the claim limitaiton of "on detection, the third pixel value(i.e., the blended pixel values) are replaced by the saved first pixel values (i.e., the pre-blend pixel values)." The Examiner respectfully disagrees with this argument. Appellant's claim 1 is broadly construed that the first pixel values corresponding to "a first display display screen area" wherein the claimed first pixel values could be the pixel values of the first window and the claimed first display screen area could be any display screen area including the whole monitor screen area or the screen area occupied by the window or a portion of the screen area within the window.

Gough teaches in column 8, lines 22-43 that in Macintosh operating system, windows can be opened up and each window is saved in the memory banks. It is well known that in Macintosh operating system, window 44 underneath window 64 in Fig. 4 can be brought up into view by clicking on the window 44.

Moreover, Gough clearly teaches replacing the blended pixel values with the saved first pixel values. In column 6, lines 50-67, Gough teaches "a user taps on a transparency icon 68 on

the keyboard image 64 of Fig. 3 with the stylus 38 to cause the keyboard 64 to become partially transparent or translucent...Tapping on the transparency icon 68 of the keyboard image 64' of Fig. 4 would cause the solid keyboard image 64 of Fig. 3 to reappear".

It is clear that the blended pixel values are shown in Fig. 4 and the pre-blended pixel values are shown in Fig. 3. In column 6, lines 50-67, Gough teaches the display operation initiated by a user tapping on the transparency icon 68 of the keyboard image 64' of Fig. 4 to replace the blended pixel values of Fig. 4 with the pre-blended pixel values of Fig. 3.

In another non-limiting example, Gough teaches in column 6-7 as corresponding to the Figs. 3, 4 and 5a-5c the claim limitations set forth in the claim 1. For example, the first pixel values for the "r" key in corresponding to the window 64' of Fig. 4 is saved. The blending operation takes place in Fig. 5a wherein the "r" key is shaded and therefore the "r" key in window 64' of Fig. 4 is replaced with the blended pixel values for the "r" key in Fig. 5a wherein the second pixel values are the pixel values of the window 44 located underneath the window 64'. Gough further teaches monitoring/intercepting the tap action on the keyboard 64' and tapping on the "i" key in Fig. 4b impacts the pixel values in the window 64' which meets the claim limitation of "the first display screen area". Upon detection of such a display tapping operaiton, replacing the shaded "r" in Fig. 5a with the unshaded "r" wherein the unshaded "r" represent the first pixel values. Upon completion of the tapping operation on the "i" key, copying and saving the unshaded "i" pixel values (i.e., meeting the claim limitation of the fourth pixel values) corresponding to the window 64'. The blended/shaded pixel values (meeting the claim limitation of the fifth pixel values) for the "i" key are shown in Fig. 5b wherein the second pixel values are still the pixel values for the window 44 lying underneath the window 64'. Fig. 5b also

shows the step of replacing the unblended/unshaded pixel values of the "i" key in Fig. 5a with the blended/shaded pixel values of the "i" key in Fig. 5b. This process continues in Fig. 5c for different keys.

Appellant argued with respect to the teaching in Gough elsewhere with regards to the claim limitations set forth in the claim 1. The Examiner will also address them in responses to arguments (B) and (C), which is also related to the arguments in (A).

Appellant argues the "swap back" approach is novel. The Examiner respectfully disagrees with this argument. Appellant's claimed invention as embodied in appellant's drawing of Figs. 1a-1e are no different from the prior art teaching set forth in the Figs. 3, 4 and 5a-5c.

In another non-limiting example, Gough teaches in column 11, lines 1-21 remapping certain pages of VRAM to the RAM screen buffer when an overlay image contains objects that overlap these pages. The redirected pages of VRAM include portions of VRAM screen buffer that does not overlap by the overlay image and portions of VRAM screen that overlaps by the overlay image; see column 11, lines 10-21. Gough teaches column 12, lines 1-17 that "writing images that are intended for VRAM into RAM and vice versa (i.e., from RAM to VRAM)". This passage exactly teaches the first pixel values in RAM are swapped back to VRAM. Gough not only teaches redirected pages are written from VRAM to RAM wherein Gough teaches swapping pages 242A and 242B causing a portion of the screen as stored in the VRAM memory page 242A to be drawn "off screen" in RAM memory page 242B, but also teaches the directed pages are swapped back from RAM to VRAM.

However, Appellant continued to argue that pre-blended original image is never written back from RAM to VRAM while the claim 1 requires the first pixel values are written back from

RAM to VRAM. However, this swapping back of the first pixel values from RAM to VRAM occurs in any of the multiple display operations. Gough teaches that the pixel values in RAM are swapped back to the pixel values in VRAM. Gough **further teaches** swapping pages 242A of VRAM with pages 242B of RAM. Gough teaches in *column 12, lines 33-45* that the shield rectangle is divided into component rectangles that intersect redirected pages of the display memory wherein the redirected page concept was explained with reference to Fig. 14B and column 12, lines 1-17. In column 12, lines 33-45, Gough teaches that the component rectangles are then blended. From this passage, it is clear that the redirected page occurs **prior to** the blending operation and thus meets the claim limitation of "the first pixel values". Gough teaches in Fig. 16, block 260 of moving redirected pages back to VRAM, and thus replacing the pages in VRAM with the directed pages wherein the directed pages occurs prior to the blending operations of the component rectangles as taught in column 12, lines 33-45.

On Pages 22-3 in the remarks, the Appellant argued with respect to the claim 1 in substance:

> (B) "Gough does not teach or suggest the recited required "swap back' of claim 1, replacing the prior blended result (third pixel values) with the pre-blend pixel values (first pixel values)...the Examiner repeatedly reasoned that applicant's swap back limitation is anticipated by Gough."

In response to the argument in (B), Appellant's claim 1 does not recite the "swap back" set forth in the argument (B). Appellant's claimed first pixel values are not necessarily the pre-blend pixel values. Appellant's argument of "pre-blended pixel values" is vague with respect to the multiple blending operations. Appellant's claim limitations set forth in the claim 1 are

broadly construed. Even if the claimed first pixel values are the pre-blend pixel values in a blending operation, Gough teaches the claimed limitations set forth in the claim 1. For example, in column 6, lines 50-67, Gough teaches the display operation initiated by a user tapping on the transparency icon 68 of the keyboard image 64' of Fig. 4 to replace the blended pixel values of Fig. 4 with the pre-blended pixel values of Fig. 3.

In another non-limiting example, Gough teaches in column 11, lines 1-21 remapping certain pages of VRAM to the RAM screen buffer when an overlay image contains objects that overlap these pages. The redirected pages of VRAM include portions of VRAM screen buffer that does not overlap by the overlay image and portions of VRAM screen that overlaps by the overlay image; see column 11, lines 10-21. Gough teaches column 12, lines 1-17 that "writing images that are intended for VRAM into RAM and vice versa (i.e., from RAM to VRAM)". This passage exactly teaches the first pixel values in RAM are swapped back to VRAM. Gough not only teaches redirected pages are written from VRAM to RAM wherein Gough teaches swapping pages 242A and 242B causing a portion of the screen as stored in the VRAM memory page 242A to be drawn "off screen" in RAM memory page 242B, but also teaches the directed pages are swapped back from RAM to VRAM.

However, Appellant continued to argue that pre-blended original image is never written back from RAM to VRAM while the claim 1 requires the first pixel values are written back from RAM to VRAM. However, this swapping back of the first pixel values from RAM to VRAM occurs in any of the multiple display operations. Gough teaches that the pixel values in RAM are swapped back to the pixel values in VRAM. Gough **further teaches** swapping pages 242A of VRAM with pages 242B of RAM. Gough teaches in *column 12, lines 33-45* that the shield

rectangle is divided into component rectangles that intersect redirected pages of the display memory wherein the redirected page concept was explained with reference to Fig. 14B and column 12, lines 1-17. In column 12, lines 33-45, Gough teaches that the component rectangles are then blended. From this passage, it is clear that the redirected page occurs **prior to** the blending operation and thus meets the claim limitation of "the first pixel values". Gough teaches in Fig. 16, block 260 of moving redirected pages back to VRAM, and thus replacing the pages in VRAM with the directed pages wherein the directed pages occurs prior to the blending operations of the component rectangles as taught in column 12, lines 33-45.

On Page 23 in the remarks, the Appellant argued with respect to the claim 1 in substance:

> (C) "Applicant's swap back limitation requires the replacement of the blended pixels with the saved away pre-blend original pixels. In Gough's case all writings from RAM to VRAM are newly blended images. Pre-blend image is copied out from VRAM to RAM only once, prior to the first blending operation, and this pre-blend image is never written back into VRAM. Therefore, blending occurs in RAM without further requiring any copy out from VRAM, and the resulting newly blended image of each successive blending operation is written out from RAM to VRAM to replace the prior blended image. As stated earlier, in Gough, pre-blended image is never written back from RAM to VRAM."

In response to the argument in (C), Appellant's claim limitations set forth in the claim 1 are broadly construed. The claimed first pixel values are not necessarily pre-blended pixel values. The first pixel values could also be blended or the intermediate pixel values prior of the

one of the blending operation of the multiple blending operations taught in Figs. 3, 4 and 5a-5c of Gough when a user opens up a new window or taps on the keys on the keyboard image.

Appellant speculated on Gough's teaching that, "pre-blend image is copied out from VRAM to RAM only once". This statement is simply incorrect. In Gough's Fig. 11, the processes 186, 190 and 202 are repeatedly called with respect to a new blending operation or a new window operation. Gough's Fig. 13, block 224 clearly shows that data are copied from VRAM to RAM for each touched page and the process 186 is repeatedly called by the Macintosh operating system when there is an intercept call to the shield cursor routine in any of the multiple blending operations taught in Figs. 3, 4 and 5a-5c of Gough and therefore the first pixel values in RAM are written back to VRAM multiple times. This copying operations and the process 186 are repeatedly called when the display are operated by a user tapping on the keys on the keyboard image. Appellant further argues with respect to the replacement of the blended pixels with the saved away pre-blended original pixels. As noted before, the claimed first pixel values are not necessary the pre-blended original pixel values. The pre-blended original pixel values are not found in the claim 1 as claim limitation. Even if the claimed first pixel values must be pre-blended original pixel values in a *specific* blending operation, Gough clearly teaches replacing the blended pixel values with the saved first pixel values. In column 6, lines 50-67, Gough teaches "a user taps on a transparency icon 68 on the keyboard image 64 of Fig. 3 with the stylus 38 to cause the keyboard 64 to become partially transparent or translucent...Tapping on the transparency icon 68 of the keyboard image 64' of Fig. 4 would cause the solid keyboard image 64 of Fig. 3 to reappear".

Appellant speculated that, in Gough, pre-blended image is never written back from RAM to VRAM. The Examiner respectfully disagrees with the appellant's argument. Even if judging whether the claim limitations reads on the Figs. 11-16 of Gough, Gough teaches in column 11, lines 1-21 remapping certain pages of VRAM to the RAM screen buffer when an overlay image contains objects that overlap these pages. The redirected pages of VRAM include portions of VRAM screen buffer that does not overlap by the overlay image and portions of VRAM screen that overlaps by the overlay image; see column 11, lines 10-21. Gough teaches column 12, lines 1-17 that "writing images that are intended for VRAM into RAM and vice versa (i.e., the RAM to VRAM)." However, Appellant still argues that pre-blended image is never written back from RAM to VRAM. In Gough, the swapping back of RAM to VRAM occurs in *any* of the display operations. Gough teaches that pixel values in RAM are swapped back to the pixel values in VRAM as the images/pages/pixels are exchanged between VRAM and RAM. Gough **further teaches** swapping pages 242A of VRAM with pages 242B of RAM. Gough teaches in column 12, lines 33-45 that the shield rectangle is divided into component rectangles that intersect redirected pages of the display memory wherein the redirected page concept was explained with reference to Fig. 14B and column 12, lines 1-17. The component rectangles are then blended. From this passage, it is clear that the redirected page occurs **prior to** *a blending operation* and thus meets the claim limitation of "the first pixel values". Gough teaches in Fig. 16, block 260 of moving redirected pages back to VRAM, and thus replacing the pages in VRAM with the directed pages wherein the directed pages occurs prior to the blending operations of the component rectangles as taught in column 12, lines 33045.

Appellant insisted that the claimed first pixel values should be the pre-blended original pixel values. The Examiner respectfully disagrees with the appellant's argument. The claimed first pixel values could be any pixel values to start with in a process according to the claim invention set forth in the claim 1. The claimed first pixel values could also be some other blended or the intermediate pixel values to start with prior to the any of the multiple blending operations taught in Figs. 3, 4 and 5a-5c of Gough. Appellant's argument of "pre-blended original pixels" is vague and ambiguous with respect to the presence of the multiple blending operations. Appellant is ignorant of the multiple blending operations of Gough. Appellant apparently argues with respect to a single blending operation. Moreover, Appellant indicated that "redirected pages" or "images" in VRAM in column 11 of Gough are not necessarily the "pre-blended" original pixel values while the pages of VRAM set forth in the block 222 of Fig. 13 of Gough are the pre-blended pixel values, however, the claimed first pixel values are broadly construed and may not necessarily be the *specific* pixel values as argued by the appellant. Moreover, the swapping of pages in Gough is not necessarily restricted to the redirected pages or image pixels between RAM and VRAM in the block 226 within the process 186, it also happens within process 202, wherein each of the processes is repeatedly called by the operating system or the application program.

(11) Related Proceeding(s) Appendix

No decision rendered by a court or the Board is identified by the examiner in the Related Appeals and Interferences section of this examiner's answer.

For the above reasons, it is believed that the rejections should be sustained.

Respectfully submitted,

Jin-Cheng Wang

Conferees:

Kee Tung

Xiao Wu

KEE M. TUNG
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER

XIAO WU
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER